

### REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 16, and 17 have been amended. Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1-5 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Umeda (US 6,597,158). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a power supply apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, "a first power supply circuit ... providing [a] first voltage to an output voltage terminal; and ... [a] second power supply circuit being controlled to be turned on and off; wherein the first power supply circuit is further operable to: sense an output voltage at the output terminal, determine whether the second power supply circuit is inactivated based on the output voltage sensed at the output terminal, and provide the first voltage to the output terminal when the second power supply circuit is inactivated" (emphasis added). Claims 16 and 17 recite similar limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Umeda does not disclose these limitations.

To the contrary, Umeda discloses that "[t]he step-down DC/DC converter 1 and the series regulator 2 are selectively operated based on a light load judging signal S1." Col. 3, ln. 13-15. Neither the step-down DC/DC converter 1 nor the series regulator 2 senses an output voltage at the output terminal, determines whether the other power supply is inactivated, nor provides a voltage if it determines that the other power supply is inactivated. The light load judging signal S1 of Umeda is not generated by either step-down DC/DC converter 1 or the series regulator 2, nor is it based on the output of either the step-down DC/DC converter 1 or the series regulator 2. Rather,

signal S1 is generated externally and received at a control input terminal 6. Col. 4, ln. 28-29.

Applicants respectfully submit that Umeda does not disclose, teach, or suggest a first power supply circuit operable to: sense an output voltage at the output terminal, determine whether the second power supply circuit is inactivated based on the output voltage sensed at the output terminal, and provide the first voltage to the output terminal when the second power supply circuit is inactivated as recited in claims 1, 16, and 17. Since Umeda does not disclose all the limitations of claims 1, 16, and 17, claims 1, 16, and 17 are not anticipated by Umeda. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, as well as on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-5 and 16-17 be withdrawn.

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Umeda in view of Hiraki et al. (US 2002/0041178). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 6-7 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 6-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Umeda in view of Hiraki et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 8-9 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 8-9 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Umeda in view of Manabe et al. (US 6,236,194), and further in view of Pizzi et al. (US

5,258,701). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 10-11 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 10-11 be withdrawn.

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Umeda in view of Manabe et al., and further in view of Pizzi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 12-15 depend on claim 1 and should be allowable along with claim 1 and on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 12-15 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street NW

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants